



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,576	02/24/2004	William A. McCarty	KSCII.016A	1813

20995 7590 03/05/2010
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

PAUL, DISLER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/05/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
efiling@kmob.com
2ros@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/786,576	Applicant(s) MCCARTY ET AL.	
	Examiner DISLER PAUL	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/13/10.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

The applicant's Argument as filed on 1/13/2010 based on the amended claims as filed on 10/20/2009 has been fully considered and is persuasive, thus, the last final office action has been vacated and a new office action is now mailed.

However, upon further argument, the argument as wherein "the rail is configured to be attached to a surface other than the surfaces of the display device, wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall" has been rejected over new prior art as in Thayer (US 5,732,140).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4; 9; 16; 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being Unpatentable over Markow et al. (US 6,925, 188 B1) and Thayer (US 5,732,140).

Re claim 1, Markow et al. disclose of a modular mounting bar for securing components for used with a display device comprising a

Art Unit: 2614

housing to a surface separate from the display device (fig.1 (14); col.2 line 41-42/lower shell having a housing surface separate from the Housing of display (12)) comprising: a plurality of audio-visual modules (fig.1 (L, 32);fig.6; col.2 line 64-col.3 line 7) and a rail configured to be attached to the surface via at least one of a plurality of openings disposed along the rail and the rail being configured to receive each of the modules at a respective one of a plurality of coupling points along the rail (fig.2-4; fig.1 (44, 20; 20); fig.5 (44, 46, 20); col.3 line 23-35/rail with opening to receive the modules so as to be attached to the housing surface) and wherein the modules are positioned above or below the display device and within the vertical bound of the display device (fig.1 (L, 32, 10, 12); col.2 line 37-60/the module as being below the display screen and within the vertical bound of the display) and wherein the rail is not coupled to either the display device or the housing of the display device (fig.5; fig.1 (10, 12, 18,20) the rail/support for the modules is not couple to the display or housing of the display, since being integrated with the housing (14)) and a cover configured to be secured in front of at least a portion of one of the modules (fig.1; fig.5 (18); col.2 line 57-61).

While, Markow disclose of the surface housing (fig.1; such housing surface (14) is inherently being supported by a certain support to as to hold the portable computer). However, Markow fail to disclose of the specific wherein the surface comprises the outer

Art Unit: 2614

surface of a wall. But, Thayer disclose of computer system wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall (fig.1 (12, 16, 34); fig.2; col.2 line 36-49; col.4 line 42-60; the outer wall surface may be incorporated with the Housing of the speaker system) so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have modified the prior art with implementing the specific wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures.

Re claim 2, Markow et al. disclose of a modular mounting system for audio-visual components for use with a display device comprising a housing, comprising: at least one audio-visual module (fig.1 (L, 32); col.2 line 64-col.3 line 7/speakers and CD-ROM as the audio-visual modules); and a rail wherein the rail is configured to be attached to a surface other than surfaces of the display device (fig.1 (10, 12 18, 20); fig.5 (18, 44, 46, 20); col.3 line 23-35/rail on surface of the housing and other than the display device housing (10, 12)), wherein the rail is separate from the display device and the housing of the display device, and wherein the rail is configured to receive the module at a plurality of locations along the rail fig.1 (18, 20); fig.5 (18,

Art Unit: 2614

44, 46, 20); col.3 line 23-35/rail with opening to receive the modules), wherein the module is positioned above or below the display device and within the vertical bounds of the display device (fig.1 (L, 32, 10, 12); col.2 line 37-60/the module as being below the display screen and within the vertical bound of the display).

While, Markow disclose of the surface housing (fig.1; such housing surface (14) is inherently being supported by a certain support to as to hold the portable computer). However, Markow fail to disclose of the specific wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall. But, Thayer disclosed of computer system wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall. But, Thayer disclose of computer system wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall (fig.1 (12, 16, 34); fig.2; col.2 line 36-49: col.4 line 42-60; the outer wall surface may be incorporated with the Housing of the speaker system) so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have modified the prior art with implementing the specific wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures.

Art Unit: 2614

Re claim 3, the modular mounting system of claim 2, wherein comprising having a cover that is configured to be securely position in front of the modules (fig.1 (18); col.2 line 57-61).

Re claim 4, the modular mounting system of claim 3, wherein the cover is configured to be secured to the at least one module (fig.1 (18); col.2 line 57-61).

Re claim 9, the modular mounting system of claim 2, wherein the at least one audio-visual module comprises a loudspeaker (fig.1 (L); col.2 line 45-47; col.2 line 63-65).

Re claim 16, the assembly of claim 2, wherein the at least one of the audio-visual modules comprising a compact disk player (col.3 line 5-8).

Re claim 22, the method of Claim 24, wherein the rail has portions thereof that define a channel; and wherein the audio-visual component has attachment surfaces that matingly connect with the channel to the rail, so as to fix the component in a desired location on the rail (fig.5 (T, D); col.3 line 25-35).

RE claim 23, the method of Claim 22, further comprising: securing a cover to the component so as to secure the cover in a desired location on the component (fig.1 (18); col.3 line 33-36).

Re claim 24, Markow et al. disclose a method of mounting audio-visual components for use with a display device comprising a housing, to a surface separate from the display device (fig.1 (14); col.2 line 41-42, comprising: securing a rail to the surface, (fig.5; the rail is secured to a surface); and connecting an audio-visual component to the rail, wherein the audio-visual component is positioned above or below the display device and within the vertical bounds of the display device (fig.1 (L, 32, 10, 12); col.2 line 37-60/the module as being below the display screen and within the vertical bound of the display).

While, Markow disclose of the surface housing (fig.1; such housing surface (14) is inherently being supported by a certain support to as to hold the portable computer). However, Markow fail to disclose of the specific wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall. But, Thayer disclosed of computer system wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall. But, Thayer disclose of computer system wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall (fig.1 (12, 16, 34); fig.2; col.2 line 36-49: col.4 line 42-60; the outer wall surface may be incorporated with the Housing of the speaker system) so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have modified the prior art with implementing the

Art Unit: 2614

specific wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures.

RE claim 25, the method of Claim 24, further comprising connecting at least one additional audio-visual component to the rail (fig.2-5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markow et al. (US 6,925, 188 B1) and Thayer (US 5,732,140) and Donohoe (US 5,737,123).

Re claim 5, the modular mounting system of claim 3, but, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, fail to disclose of wherein the cover comprises a grille. But, Donohoe disclose of the similar concept of wherein the cover comprises a grille (col.3 line 35-40) for protecting the speaker against damage. Thus, it would have

Art Unit: 2614

been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the prior art with incorporating the cover comprises a grille for protecting the speaker again damage.

Similarly Re claim 29 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 5.

Claims 10; 17, 37, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markow et al. (US 6,925, 188 B1) and Thayer (US 5,732,140) and Simon (US 2001/0027560 A1).

Re claim 10, the modular mounting system of claim 2, but, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, fail to disclose of wherein at least one audio-visual module comprises a DVD player. But, Simon disclosed of a system wherein the similar concept of having such audio-visual module comprises a DVD player (fig.6; par [0043]) so as to enable user to play movies. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the prior art with incorporating audio-visual module comprises a DVD player so as to enable user to play movies.

Re claim 17, the assembly of claim 2, but, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, fail to disclose of wherein the

Art Unit: 2614

at least one of the audio-visual modules comprising a digital video recorder. But, Simon disclosed of a system wherein the similar concept of having such audio-visual module comprises a digital video recorder (fig.6; par [0043]) so as to enable user record video images. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the prior art with incorporating audio-visual module comprises a digital video recorder so as to enable user record video images.

Similarly Re claims 37, 44 have been analyzed and rejected with regard to claims 10, 17.

Claim 6-8; 11-15; 18-21; 26-28; 30-36, 38-43, 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markow et al. (US 6,925, 188 B1) and Thayer (US 5,732,140).

RE claim 6, the modular mounting system of Claim 2, but, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, fail to disclose of wherein the rail comprises a plurality of openings configured to receive a fastener, the fastener being securable to the surface.

But, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have tried in modifying the rail as disclosed with additionally having a plurality of

Art Unit: 2614

openings configured to receive a fastener, the fastener being securable to the surface with producing no unexpected result when providing further stability to the portable device.

RE claim 7, the modular mounting system of Claim 2, wherein the rail comprises: a base configured to define a mating relationship with the at least one module (fig.5 (T,B));/providing a mating relationship with the module); but, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, fail to disclose of such rail having a pair of flanges that defines a groove running along the lengthwise edge of the base.

But, it is noted the concept of having such rail having a pair of flanges that defines a groove running along the lengthwise edge of the base is merely an obvious variation of the engineering design with producing no unexpected result.

Re claim 8, the modular mounting system of Claim 7, wherein the pair of flanges each extend approximately perpendicularly from each end of the base and along opposing longitudinal edges of the base, each flange having a portion comprising an inwardly extending (see claim 7 rejection).

Re claim 11, the assembly of claim 2, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, failed wherein the module comprise an amplifier. But, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have tried in modifying the module as additionally

Art Unit: 2614

having such audio-visual module comprise an amplifier so as to increase the audio signal for the listener.

Re claim 12, the modular mounting system of claim 2, but, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, failed to disclose of the audio-visual module comprise a television tuner. Similarly, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have tried in modifying such module with additionally including such audio-visual module comprise a television tuner so as to enable the user to receive television program as desired.

RE claim 13, the modular mounting system of Claim 2, but, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, failed to disclose of wherein the at least one audio-visual module comprises an audio-visual controller.

Similarly, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have tried in modifying such module with additionally including such audio-visual module comprise an audio-visual controller so as to enable the user to manually adjust the module device.

Re claim 14, the modular mounting system of Claim 2, but, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, failed to disclose of

Art Unit: 2614

wherein the at least one audio-visual module comprises a wireless transmitter.

Similarly, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have tried in modifying such module with additionally including such audio-visual module comprise a wireless transmitter so as to relay audio-video signal to other component of the device.

RE claim 15, the modular mounting system of Claim 2, but, the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, failed to disclose of wherein the at least one audio-visual module comprises a wireless receiver.

But, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have tried in modifying such module with additionally including such audio-visual module comprise a wireless receiver so as to relay video signal received from the outside.

RE claim 18, the modular mounting system of Claim 2, but the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, failed to disclose of wherein the at least one audio-visual module comprises an MP3 player.

Art Unit: 2614

But, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have tried in modifying such module with additionally including such audio-visual module comprise an MP3 player so as to enable the storage and playing of audio files.

Re claim 19, the modular mounting system of Claim 2, but the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, failed to disclose of wherein the at least one audio-visual module comprises a central processing unit (CPU).

But, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have tried in modifying such module with additionally including such audio-visual module a central processing unit (CPU) so as to integrate all the module components for processing.

Re claim 20, the modular mounting system of Claim 2, but the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, failed to disclose of wherein the at least one audio-visual module comprises a media center.

But, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have tried in modifying such module with additionally including such audio-visual module comprises a media center so as to enable the user to play various kind of media as in (music, movies, photo) as desired.

Art Unit: 2614

Re claim 21, the modular mounting system of Claim 2, but the combined teaching of Markow et al. and Thayer as a whole, failed to disclose of wherein the at least one audio-visual module comprises an audio-visual signal distribution system.

But, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have tried in modifying such module with additionally including such audio-visual module comprises an audio-visual signal distribution system so as to distribute scrambled pay TV program provided by the TV program provider.

Re claim 26, Markow et al. disclose of an assembly for mounting audio-visual components for use with a wall-mounted display device comprising a housing, the assembly comprising: at least two audio-visual modules comprising loudspeakers (fig.1 (L, 32); col.2 line 64-col.3 line 7) ; a rail wherein the rail is configured to only be attached to a surface other than surfaces of the display device and the housing of the display device, (fig.2-5); and wherein the rail is configured to receive the modules (fig.3), wherein the audio-visual modules are positioned above or below the display device and within the vertical bounds of the display device (fig.1 (L, 32, 10, 12); col.2 line 37-60/the module as being below the display screen and

Art Unit: 2614

within the vertical bound of the display); and a cover and defining a mating relationships with the at least two modules (fig.5 (18)).

While, Markow disclose of the surface housing (fig.1; such housing surface (14) is inherently being supported by a certain support to as to hold the portable computer). However, Markow fail to disclose of the specific wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall. But, Thayer disclose of computer system wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall (fig.1 (12, 16, 34); fig.2; col.2 line 36-49; col.4 line 42-60; the outer wall surface may be incorporated with the Housing of the speaker system) so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have modified the prior art with implementing the specific wherein the surface comprises the outer surface of a wall so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures.

Similarly, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have such cover as having a dimension approximately equal to a length of the display device so as to create a more aesthetic appearance.

Art Unit: 2614

RE claim 27, the assembly of Claim 26, wherein the cover is configured to be coupled to the modules (fig.1,5 (18)).

RE claim 28, the assembly of Claim 26, wherein the cover is configured to be coupled to the rail (fig.1,5 (18)).

RE claim 30, the assembly of Claim 26, wherein comprising the modules comprising the loudspeakers (fig.5 (L)).

Similarly, it would have obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have tried in modifying the modules with further having such third module comprising a loudspeaker with producing no unexpected result based on the designer's preference.

Similarly Re claim 31-32 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claims 11, 15.

RE claim 33, Markow et al. disclose of a modular mounting bar for securing components in proximity to a display device having a width, comprising: a rail having mounting locations for audio-visual components and configured to be secured to a surface independent from the display device (fig.1 (14); fig.2-5; col.2 line 41-42/lower shell having a rail to a surface separate from the display (12)); and means for connecting an audio-visual component to multiple locations on the rail so that component locations match the width of the display device

Art Unit: 2614

(fig.1 (L); speaker match the width of display), wherein the component is positioned above or below the display device and within the vertical bounds of the display device (fig.1 (L, 32, 10, 12); col.2 line 37-60/the module as being below the display screen and within the vertical bound of the display).

While, Markow disclose of the surface housing (fig.1; such housing surface (14) is inherently being supported by a certain support to as to hold the portable computer). However, Markow fail to disclose of the specific wherein the surface as being the surface of a wall. But, Thayer disclose of computer system wherein the surface as being the surface of a wall (fig.1 (12, 16, 34); fig.2; col.2 line 36-49: col.4 line 42-60; the outer wall surface may be incorporated with the Housing of the speaker system) so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have modified the prior art with implementing the specific wherein the surface as being the surface of a wall so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures.

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have the display device being secured to the wall so as to provide the display with additional stability.

Art Unit: 2614

RE claim 34, the module mounting bar of Claim 33, further comprising means for connecting at least one additional audio-visual component to the rail(fig.3 (L)).

Re claim 35, Markow et al. disclose of a modular mounting bar for securing components in proximity to a display device having a width, comprising: a plurality of audio-visual-modules (fig.1 (L, 32); col.2 line 64-col.3 line 7/speakers and CD-ROM as the audio-visual modules); a rail configured to be secured to an outer surface independent from the display device and having a length (fig.2-4; fig.1 (10, 12, 44; 20); fig.5 (44,20); col.3 line 23-35); wherein the rail has a plurality of mounting holes at each of a plurality of module mounting locations to match module mounting to the width of the display device, and wherein each of the modules is configured to be attached to the rail at a respective one of the module mounting locations fig.2-4; fig.1 (44; 20); fig.5 (44,20); col.3 line 23-35/rail with opening to receive the modules), wherein the modules are positioned above or below the display device and within the vertical bounds of the display device fig.1 (L, 32, 10, 12); col.2 line 37-60/the module as being below the display screen and within the vertical bound of the display); and a cover having a length (fig.1 (18); col.2 line 55-60).

While, Markow disclose of the surface housing (fig.1; such housing surface (14) is inherently being supported by a certain

Art Unit: 2614

support to as to hold the portable computer). However, Markow fail to disclose of the specific wherein the surface as being the surface of a wall. But, Thayer disclose of computer system wherein the surface as being the surface of a wall (fig.1 (12, 16, 34); fig.2; col.2 line 36-49: col.4 line 42-60; the outer wall surface may be incorporated with the Housing of the speaker system) so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have modified the prior art with implementing the specific wherein the surface as being the surface of a wall so as to provide good sound capability and being compatible with the small portable computer speaker enclosures.

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have the display device being secured to the wall so as to provide the display with additional stability.

Similarly, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have tried in modifying such length of the rail with additionally having the length not being greater than the width of the display device with producing no unexpected result.

Also, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to have such cover as being substantially the same as the

Art Unit: 2614

width of the display device for providing a more aesthetic appearance to the device.

Re claim 36, the modular mounting bar of Claim 35, wherein at least one of the audio-visual modules comprises a loudspeaker (fig.1 (L)).

Re claim 43, the modular mounting bar of claim 35, wherein at least one of the audio-visual modules comprise a compact disc player (col.3 line 5-8).

Similarly, RE claims 38-42; 45-48 have been analyzed and rejected with respect to claims 11-15, 18-21.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Disler Paul whose telephone number is 571-270-1187. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chin Vivian can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

Art Unit: 2614

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/Xu Mei/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614